

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

PILRANG BAE OWA,

Plaintiff,

v.

FRED MEYER STORES, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C16-1236 RAJ

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for extension of discovery deadlines. Dkt. # 84. Defendant Fred Meyer Stores ("Fred Meyer") opposes the motion. Dkt. # 87.

The Court set the discovery cutoff in this matter for December 18, 2017. Dkt. # 78. The Court further required that "[a]ll motions related to discovery must be noted on the motion calendar no later than the Friday before discovery closes pursuant to LCR 7(d)(3)." *Id.* The Scheduling Order in this matter is strict, warning that "[t]hese are firm dates that can be changed only by order of the Court, not by agreement of counsel or the parties." *Id.* The Court may order such a change "only for good cause." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4).

1 Plaintiff has not shown good cause to modify the Scheduling Order. It appears  
2 from the motion that the only basis for “good cause” is Plaintiff’s carelessness, *see* Dkt. #  
3 84 at 2 (stating that “the Court’s electronically transmitted Order . . . escaped the  
4 undersigned’s attention”), and time restraints in association with prosecuting her own  
5 case, *see id.* at 2-5 (explaining that Plaintiff demonstrated due diligence and good faith by  
6 responding to discovery, pursuing mediation, and defending depositions). Nothing in  
7 Plaintiff’s motion suggests to the Court that there is good cause to modify the Scheduling  
8 Order.

9 For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motion. Dkt. # 84.

10 Dated this 4th day of January, 2018.

11  
12   
13

14 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
15 United States District Judge  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27